

R E M A R K S

By this Amendment the specification has been amended to include standard topic headings. Entry is requested.

In the outstanding Office Action the examiner has rejected claims 26-31 and 34-38 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Falgout, and he has stated that claims 32, 33 and 39-49 define allowable subject matter.

The applicants thank the examiner for his indication of allowable subject matter in claims 32, 33 and 39-49; however, they assert that his prior art rejection against the other claims is incorrect.

Falgout disclose a one-way drill string clutch which includes a clutch element 24 and a body 20. As stated at column 3, line 66 et seq., the clutch element 24 is rotationally secured to body 20 by mating splines 20e and 24e. Clutch element 24 is axially movable relative to the body upwardly but this does not disconnect the mating splines and hence does not effect a change between a rotational and non rotational connection between the two elements corresponding to the activated and un-activated positions defined in applicants' claim 1. It is clearly shown in Fig. 4 that the splines 20e extend upwards in a manner which will mean that in both the raised and lowered positions of the clutch element 24, the rotational connection between body 20 and clutch element 24 will be maintained. Accordingly, the two elements which the examiner has identified in Falgout as corresponding to the first and second elements

defined in applicants' claim 1 are not able to adopt activated and unactivated positions since, in both relative positions, there is a rotational drive connection between them.

Moreover, the two axially spaced apart configurations which can be adopted by parts 20 and 24 in Falgout are not both mechanically stable. When the clutch element 24 is raised relative to the body 20, the locking elements 23 are cammed inwardly. However, while it is not clear from the description how the upward movement of the clutch element 24 is achieved, I believe that this is through the reverse rotational movement of the element which causes the elements of the lower clutch illustrated in Fig. 3 to separate. Clearly, this relies on the maintenance of the counter rotation since as soon as rotation takes place in the opposite, the clutch will reengage causing clutch element 24 to drop down and hence the configuration to return to its first position. As a result, the raised position of clutch element 24 in Falgout is not mechanically stable contrary to the assertion of the examiner.

The examiner's prior art rejection based on Falgout should be
withdrawn and all of claims 26-49 allowed.

Respectfully submitted,

DYKEMA GOSSETT PLLC

By: 

Richard H. Tushnet

Registration No. 27,297

Franklin Square, Third Floor West

1300 I Street, N.W.

Washington, DC 20005-3353

(202) 906-8680